

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address. COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/996,649	11/28/2001	Kenjiro Ito	2204-011944	5736
7590 08/06/2004			EXAMINER	
Russell D. Orkin			YEE, DEBORAH	
	im Logsdon Orkin & Han	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
700 Koppers Building			ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER
436 Seventh Avenue			1742	
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818			DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				N			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	0.577	09/996,649	ITO ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·		Deborah Yee	1742				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communicately Reply	ation appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence ac	Idress			
THE M Extensi after SI - If the po - If NO p - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, ons of time may be available under the provisions of X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) deriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statut to reply within the set or extended period for reply will be yreceived by the Office later than three months after patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, maication.  days, a reply within the statutory minimum of tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6).  I, by statute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed f thirty (30) days will be considered time MONTHS from the mailing date of this of the ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>16 June 2004</u> .					
2a)□ T	his action is FINAL. 2b	)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositio	n of Claims						
4; 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C	Claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are pending in the a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.					
Application	n Papers						
9) <u></u> ⊤l	ne specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.					
10) <b>□ T</b> I	ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	ı)□ accepted or b)□ objected	to by the Examiner.				
	pplicant may not request that any objection	÷	•				
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the ne oath or declaration is objected to b			· ·			
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)□ 1. 2.	cknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority do Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internationa	cuments have been received. cuments have been received i the priority documents have be	n Application No	Stage			
* Se	e the attached detailed Office action f		not received.				
Attachment(s		— .					
2)  Notice o 3)  Informat	of References Cited (PTO-892)  If Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO  Ition Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT  Ition(s)/Mail Date	-948) Paper i	w Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTC 	<b>)-152)</b>			

Application/Control Number: 09/996,649

Art Unit: 1742

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Genma et al. (US Patent 5,202,088).
- 4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickner (US Patent 3,713,812).
- 5. Each reference teaches a ferritic steel alloy having a composition which meets one or more of the recited claims. See Genma, alloys 7,8, 12-16, and 29-33 in Table 2, colums 5-8; and Brickner, alloys V9157-2,v9163-1 to V9167-1 in Table I of column 3.
- 6. Moreover in regard to carbide precipitation, Genma on lines 8 to 29 in column 3 discloses the formation of V and Nb carbides, and Brickner on lines 15 to 20 in column 4 suggest interaction between carbon and Cb (Nb). Although Ti, Nb, Zr, V and/or W carbide precipitates distributed in a steel matrix is 0.1wt% or more as recited by the claims 1 and 3 is not taught by prior art, such carbide distribution would be expected since compositional limitations are met and in absence of proof to the contrary.

Application/Control Number: 09/996,649

Art Unit: 1742

Page 3

7. Also even though prior art does not specifically teach a cold rolled steel sheet as recited by the claims, such would not be a patentable distinction. Note that cold rolling is a well -known technique in the metallurgical art to further shape and strengthen steel and hence would be a matter of choice well within the skill of the artisan to apply to steel to produce no new and unexpected results. Moreover, applicant's specification does not suggest cold rolling as a critical step since present invention can be made by other techniques such as, hot rolling and annealing as evident on page 6 of his specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Yee whose telephone number is 571-272-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Deboral Yee Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742